

Remarks

Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 16-17 are pending. The pending claims each have been amended only in regard to the form. No new issue has been introduced. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 18, 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Todokoro.

The inventive driver circuit is operable to automatically optimize its adjustable characteristic. The driver circuit is configured with 1) means for storing a value of basic setting, which is determined during the manufacturing process; and 2) means for storing a value of correction factor associated with the value of basic setting. To realize the inventive automatic adjustment of the drive circuit, both the value of basic setting AND the value of correction factor are used to alter the adjustable characteristic of the drive circuit. See Specification, lines 22-25. As a consequence, the manufacturer of a display module including the coupled drive circuit and display device can optimize the optical quality of the display module. *Id.*

Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, the following:

“the driver circuit is operative to adjust the adjustable characteristic by modifying the value of the basic setting by the value of correction factor.”

In contrast, Todokoro teaches that a driving data - adjustable characteristic - is changed **only by a correction factor**. The value of the basic setting, however, remains **unmodified and is not used in adjusting the driving data** regardless of a mode in which Todokoro's device operates, as will be discussed hereinbelow. Todokoro discloses three modes: an initial characteristic check mode, normal drive mode and characteristic change mode.

In the initial characteristic mode, Todokoro teaches determining a value of variable correction factor and a value of initial/basic setting. The determined values of the correction factor and basic setting are stored in respective memories 8 and 11. See Todokoro, FIG. 1. No modification of the driving data is performed in this mode. Thus, contrary to the invention, as recited in claim 1, Todokoro has no teaching of and no need

for adjusting an adjustable characteristic by modifying “the value of basic setting” in this mode.

The normal drive mode is characterized by **modifying a driving data exclusively by a correction factor**. Todokoro explicitly teaches executing this mode so that “none of the memory 11, the comparator 10, and the test pattern generator 13 need be operated.” See Todokoro, col. 11, lines 15-17. (Emphasis added) The memory 11 is, of course, operable to store the value of basic setting. Consequently, Todokoro neither teaches nor suggests “modifying the value of the basic setting by the value of correction factor” in the normal drive mode, as recited in Claim 1.

Finally, the characteristic change mode is characterized by **modifying the value of correction factor** in response to “a change with time in the electron emission characteristic of each surface conduction electron emitting device.” See Todokoro, col. 11, lines 21-23. This mode, like the initial characteristic mode, is executed for determination of a new, updated value of the correction factor based on a difference between values of currently measured drive signal and previous / stored initial setting. See Todokoro, col. 12, lines 7-14. If the difference exceeds a certain range, the updated value of the correction factor is adjusted by dividing “a predetermined design value by the measured value after the change with time.” See Todokoro, lines 21-23.

Subsequently, the **adjusted** correction factor is stored “in the memory 8” and **used for modifying a driving signal** during a new normal drive mode, in which the value of the initial setting is **neither operable nor modifiable**. Thus, the characteristic change mode of Todokoro, like the drive mode, is executed by modifying an adjustable characteristic of a driving data **only by the correction factor**. The basic setting does not factor in adjusting the adjustable characteristic of the drive data as explicitly taught by Todokoro in col. 11, lines 15-17 which are quoted hereinabove. Consequently, the value of the initial or basic setting remains **unmodified, invariable or constant** in each of the characteristic change, initial characteristic and normal drive modes of Todokoro, whereas a value of correction factor is periodically modified. See Todokoro, col. 12, lines 43-45. The driving data has its adjustable characteristic modified **only by the correction factor**. As a result, Todokoro fails to teach or suggest that “the driver circuit is operative to adjust the adjustable characteristic by **modifying the value of the basic setting by the**

value of correction factor", as recited in Claim 1.

The Examiner contends that "adjustable characteristic of the driver circuit is operable **in combination of initial (basic) setting and the value of correction factor.**" FOA, page 11, lines 3-4. Based on the foregoing, this statement is not substantiated by Todokoro which teaches using only a **single parameter – correction factor** – to adjust a characteristic of driver device. In contrast, Claim 1 of the invention recites **two parameters – correction factor and initial setting** – which operate concurrently to modify the adjustable characteristic of driver device.

As it appears and until rebutted by the Examiner, Todokoro fails to teach or suggest, among other things, Applicant's features as discussed hereinabove. Any analogy between Todokoro's disclosure (as discussed and reproduced above) and Applicant's recitation in claim 1 does not have any factual basis in the record.

Pursuant to MPEP, Section 2131 and 35 U.S.C. §102(b), to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. As discussed above, Todokoro fails to teach "modifying the value of the basic setting by the value of correction factor" of Applicant's claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Todokoro.

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1, and thus, benefits from its patentability.

Independent claims 6, 10 and 18 recite, among other limitations, the limitations discussed above in reference to Claim 1 and are, thus, patentable as well along with respective dependent claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 8, 9, 11-13, 17 and 19 stand unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Todokoro in view Yamamoto.

Yamamoto, repeatedly discussed over the prosecution history of the present application, does not teach or suggest "modifying the value of the basic setting by the value of correction factor", as recited by Claim 1. Therefore, Yamamoto does not cure the deficiencies of Todokoro, and Claim 1 stands patentable over the cited combination. Consequently, Claims 3 and 9, depending from Claim 1, are patentable as well. Claim 8

DOCKET NO. CH 000008
Page 9 of 9

and claims 11-13, 17 depend from independent claims 6 and 7, respectively, which are also patentable over the cited combination. Hence, claims 8, 11-13 and 17 are patentable. Finally, Claim 19 depends from independent claim 18 and, thus, patentably distinguishes from the cited combination. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 3, 8, 9, 11-13, 17 and 19 are in order.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tokoro in view Inoue. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Todokoro in view Conover.

Inoue and Conover, discussed in previous communication, each fail to teach “modifying the value of the basic setting by the value of correction factor” and, thus, cannot cure the deficiencies of Todokoro. Claims 4 and 5 are patentable over the cited combination, and the §103 rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Conclusion

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Final Office Action and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason this application is not considered to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Yuri Kateshov, Esq., Reg. No. 34,466
The Law Office of Y. Kateshov
174 Ferndale Road
Scarsdale, NY 10583
Tel: 718 637-6077
Fax: 914-723-6822
e-mail: ykateshov@gmail.com